



MEETING NOTICE

TIME: 9:30 A.M.

DATE: August 15, 2012

PLACE: County Board Room, 2nd Floor - County Building

A G E N D A

1. CALL TO ORDER.
2. ROLL CALL.
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING.
4. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.
5. REPORT OF OFFICERS.
6. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.
7. CORRESPONDENCE.
8. PUBLIC HEARINGS.
9. COMMITTEE REPORTS.
10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.
11. NEW BUSINESS.
12. ADJOURNMENT.

MINUTES OF MEETING
Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission
July 18, 2012

1. CALL TO ORDER.

Chairman Eric Hansen called the meeting to order at 9:32 AM.

2. ROLL CALL.

Mary Jane Niemann called the roll.

JULY 2011	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	JANUARY 2012	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE
X											
X											
X											
X											
X											
X											
X											

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Eric Hansen, Chairman
 Bill Moss, Vice-Chairman
 Kenneth Springs, Secretary
 Mayor Mike Houston – M. Farmer
 Andy Van Meter – B. McFadden
 Alderman Sam Cahnman
 Alderman Doris Turner
 Tim Moore
 Andy Goleman – C. Stratton
 Leslie Sgro – B. Reardon
 Frank Vala – R. Blickensderfer
 Frank Squires
 Dick Ciotti – G. Humphrey
 Bill Looby – D. Smith
 Larry Hamlin
 Brad Mills
 Vacancy (city representative)

Others

Carole Allen	Dennis Somers
Janet Factor	Roz Stein
Joe Hurwitz	Mike Stratton
Mimi Hurwitz	Peg Tanner
Anne Logue	Steve Walker
Phil Martin	Kammy Wood
James Olguin	

Staff

Molly Berns
 Abby Bybee
 Mary Jane Niemann
 Norm Sims
 Joe Zeibert

3. **MINUTES OF MEETING.**

Chairman Eric Hansen asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the June 20, 2012 Regional Planning Commission meeting. There were none. The minutes were accepted as mailed.

4. **MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.**

There was no meeting of the Executive Policy Board.

5. **REPORT OF OFFICERS.**

Chairman Eric Hansen said the Commission's by-laws require that members of all committees of the Commission serve at the will of the Chair. Hansen said there is one ongoing committee – the Land Subdivision Committee and with the change in the Chairman, Regional Planning Commission staff had advised him that the membership of this committee must be reappointed for the new Commission year. With the advice of staff, Chairman Hansen reappointed all current members of the Land Subdivision Committee. The list of those reappointments was available on the table as meeting attendees signed in. Chairman Hansen then asked the Executive Director to add the following reappointments to the record of this meeting:

Land Subdivision Committee – Appointments for PY 2012-2013

Member	Representing
Gregg Humphrey, Chairman	Springfield Metro Sanitary District
Steve Stewart, Vice Chairman	CWLP – Water
Nate Bottom	Springfield Dept. of Public Works
Joe Gooden	Springfield Building & Zoning Dept.
James Fulgenzi	Springfield Park District
Rick Weber	Springfield Fire Dept.
Roleen Thoele	CWLP – Electric
Tim Zahrn	Sangamon County Highway Dept.
Lori Williams	Springfield Public Works Dept.
Steve Hall	Sangamon County Public Health Dept.
Cyndi Knowles	County Zoning Administrator
Paul O'Shea	Springfield Office of Planning and Economic Development
Tim Hasara	Curran-Gardner Public Water District
Kenneth Springs	Citizen Member
Dean Graven	Citizen Member

All SSCRPC officers serve as ex-officio members of the Land Subdivision Committee.

6. **REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**

Norm Sims stated that due to the number of subdivision projects to be reviewed this month, he would delay his report until the August meeting.

7. **CORRESPONDENCE.**

There was no correspondence.

8. **PUBLIC HEARING.**

There was no one who wished to address the Commission.

9. **COMMITTEE REPORTS.**

Joe Zeibert presented the following projects to be reviewed by the Planning Commission this month via a power point presentation. He stated there were six items to be reviewed, all being located within the City of Springfield's subdivision jurisdiction.

Schnucks West

Location & Sketch Map

Variance of Sec. 153.157(J) – Stub Streets - to allow an access easement to serve the undeveloped property in lieu of a public street

Variance of Sec. 153.157(L) – Restriction of Access – to allow two access points onto Bruns Lane and three access points onto Washington Street

Variance of Sec. 153.158(B)(2) – Lot Arrangement – to allow access through an access easement for Lots 3-7

Variance of Sec. 153.157(B)(3) – Street Offsets – to permit driveways that have less than 150' separation from each other

Description: Pt. SE ¼, SW ¼, Section 29, T16N, R5W (Northeast corner of Washington Street and Bruns Lane)

LSC Action: Recommend approval of the location & sketch map and variances.

Zeibert said this development is located on the northeast corner of Bruns Lane and Washington Street. It is comprised of seven lots on 20 acres. The large lots will be 9.44 acres in size with some out lots in front. There is a park area shown that is 1.7 acres in size.

Zeibert then summarized the variances requested and Land Subdivision Committee action on the proposed project:

- (1) A variance of Sec. 153.157(L) – Restriction of Access – to allow two access points onto Bruns Lane and three access points onto Washington Street was requested and approved conditioned upon the location of the access points being determined by the traffic study which will be done with the preliminary plan.
- (2) A variance of Sec. 153.158(B)(2) – Lot Arrangement – to allow access through an access easement for Lots 3-7 was requested and approved. Zeibert said the ordinance requires that all lots be served by a public road. In this case, the out lots will be served by private access easements which are common with commercial developments.

- (3) A variance of Sec. 153.157(J) – Stub Streets - to allow an access easement to serve the undeveloped property in lieu of a public street. Zeibert noted that the ordinance requires that a stub street be provided to all undeveloped land. The variance was approved with the condition that an access easement be provided to the Diocese property. The easement will be shown with the preliminary plan.
- (4) A variance of Sec. 153.157(B)(3) – Street Offsets – to permit driveways that have less than 150' separation from each other was requested. Zeibert noted that the ordinance requires proposed streets to line up with existing access points on the other side of the road or they need to be offset 150'. In this case, the ones along Washington are offset, but do not meet the 150' requirement.
- (5) Zeibert stated that this proposed development is a commercial use and noted that the zoning is already in place. The location and sketch map and variances were approved by the Land Subdivision Committee.

Brad Mills moved to concur with the recommendation of the Land Subdivision Committee to recommend approval of the location & sketch map and variances.

Frank Squires asked about the access points. Zeibert pointed them out on the aerial. Squires asked how far the first access point was from the Griffin complex. Phil Martin said it was 60' from the east property line to the Diocese parking lot and approximately 150'-200' to the next access. Martin said the access points on Washington Street line up with the Fairhills Mall entrances. Access points on Bruns Lane line up with Jeanette and Timberbrook.

Peg Tanner referenced Sector 10 of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan and said it does not include heavy commercial. She asked what evidence was presented (studies, etc.) that this is wanted/needed in the area. Sims stated that use is determined through the zoning process and reiterated that zoning has been approved for this parcel. Sims said evidence was presented at the hearing as part of the record of that meeting. Tanner asked when that meeting was held. Molly Berns believed that it was heard by the City Council in May or June and noted that the zoning meeting at the city would have been held a month prior. Tanner said that people have 90 days after that to file any complaints. Sims said that he would not respond to any legal matter in regards to what someone may do in response to a city action. He said he was just saying that zoning has been approved for the property. Sims said there is an option under City Code where someone (an adjoining property owner) may file a valid petition at the time the case is presented to the City Council. Sims said he was not aware of any petition filed by an adjacent property owner. He noted that the purpose of the Land Subdivision Committee review and Regional Planning Commission review was for a design development point of view – Does the parcel work for the development?

Tanner asked the exact date of when the zoning was approved. Martin said the zoning was approved on June 19.

Janet Factor said she was concerned about what she learned at the Park Board meeting held on Monday night that when this committee approved this plan, they were not aware of the implications of the City Subdivision Ordinance. The counsel for the Park Board has interpreted this ordinance as saying that once the Planning Commission approves a plan, the Park Board has no voice in any position or anything else about the park – only accept or reject it as presented in the approved plan. Factor said by approving this plan, the Planning

Commission will remove all power by the Park Board to negotiate, which is problematic since the city plan shows the park in a different location. She expressed concern that a legal precedent would be set if the plan was approved that would essentially give every developer in the city who wants to put in a subdivision the dictatorial power over the location of the parks. Factor said this is an obvious opportunity for abuse. Any developer could foist off any portion of land that he doesn't want and make that what is offered to the Park District and make certain that no park appears. Or if he discovers a problem on some portion of his land, he could appoint that area for parks, convince the Park District to take it and then later on the Park District would find out the land is polluted. Because there is this weakness in the city ordinance, the ordinance should be amended. Factor suggested that this be sent back to committee for reconsideration and that the committee add a proviso that the plan must be accepted by the Park Board. That does not necessarily mean that there will be a park there. The developer could submit a plan with no park and the Park Board could accept that if they do not want a park. The problem is if you give approval on the basis that the Park Board had taken negative action or waived their rights, then the developer is being given the right or incentive to offer the worst portion of the lot for the park. If you approve it with a proviso that the Park Board accept, the developer is being given an incentive to work with the Park Board. Factor reiterated that if this plan was approved, a precedent would be set that every future subdivision to be approved, every developer will be able to say in the past you have allowed the developer to allot the land solely according to his own desires. She asked to be afforded the same privilege.

Chairmen Hansen said two people have spoken against a motion to concur. He said the comments could be entertained if this motion fails. Factor said she is speaking against the motion and saying there is an alternative.

Sims said the implication given is that the decision made today is the final decision on this project. He said that is not the case. This is the location and sketch map stage. What the Commission is doing today is making a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council makes the final determination. It has been questioned in the past as to whether or not this body has the authority to send a recommendation back to the committee for review. The ordinance specifies that the Planning Commission is to approve or deny. There is some murkiness to whether or not the Planning Commission has the authority to send back for additional review.

Sims then responded to the question regarding location of the park. The city ordinance indicates that if property is shown as park land in the City's Comprehensive Plan, that an opportunity has to be offered for possible purchase for a park. It does not specify in the ordinance where the property has to be located. Sims pointed out that even though the Comprehensive Plan indicates an area, it does not indicate where the park will be located or the size of the park. It just creates a place holder. It is left to the developer to decide where that area will be set aside and left to the Land Subdivision Committee to agree or disagree with the location and size of the park area.

Sims noted that the staff is cognizant of these kinds of issues and they look at other plans for guidance on these issues. For example, the staff looked at the Greenways Plan and Park District Master Plan when reviewing this proposed development. Neither document specifies a park in this area or offers guidance concerning size and location.

Factor said she understood that this was not final action on the plan as far as the ultimate

development. She said that according to counsel for the Park Board at the Park Board meeting on Monday night, this is the final determinate action on which they must base their decision. Sims said he appreciates counsel for the Park Board's interpretation, but cannot give a legal opinion. Chairman Hansen said he could not either, but noted that the city would have to change the ordinance, not the Park Board. Factor said she was not talking about changing the ordinance, but that according to the counsel for the Park Board, they must make their decision based on the action of the Planning Commission, not what the city finally decides. Chairman Hansen said he understood what was said, but didn't have legal counsel here to agree or not agree with that. Factor said this is something that needs to be taken into account.

Factor said as far as the city plan, she understood that it is not highly specific, however it is presented in map form on a scale map which means that it is intrinsically location specific. She stated it shows the park in a different location fronting on Washington Street. She said the only way to know what was intended on that map is to talk to the person who drew the map and that is something that should be considered. She felt there had to be some reason why the park was drawn where it was.

Tanner asked if a quorum was present. Chairman Hansen said a quorum was present.

Kammy Wood asked for clarification regarding minutes of the May 3rd Land Subdivision Committee meeting. In those minutes she said the development indicated having three conversations with the Park District president and expected a waiver shortly. She said later in those same minutes the developer advised that the Park District had no intention of purchasing the property. When she mentioned these statements at the Park Board meeting, the Park Board said that these were in fact misrepresentations of what they had said. So as a member of the public, Wood is looking for direction in what is going on here and clarification of who said what to whom at that meeting and if these statements are true, how did they occur prior to any public hearings from the Park Board about whether they were going to purchase or not purchase the property.

Joe Hurwitz said they did everything correctly by the book. They met with the alderman, the staff and were unanimously approved by the staff, Land Subdivision Committee and were approved 8-2 at City Council. He said he had three conversations with the Park District. He met with Leslie Sgro on two occasions. He said when he met with Sgro the first time, she did not know what the process was as nothing like this had come up in 10-12 years. They explained to him that it was not in the Master Plan and that their intention at that time was to explore the situation. Subsequent to that, people have started to discuss the trees and they revisited the issue. He has met with the Park District twice since (with Mike Stratton and several board members). Hurwitz said they attended every meeting it was openly discussed and they said at that point there was no money available, but they were going to explore the issue. He said when they met with the Planning Commission the first time along with Phil Martin, they were under the impression that there was not going to be an issue. Subsequently an issue came up that you all want to save the trees. He said the Diocese owns the property and Schnucks has entered into a contract to purchase the property and they have gone through the process in the public. The Diocese has property rights and Schnucks has the right to purchase the property and build. He said they did everything correctly – they did meet with the Park District and quite frankly he said it amazes him at times that people call you names when you go into meetings. He said it gets personal when people start throwing rocks at you. He said he fully expected a letter from the Park District.

Squires asked about the five blocks along Washington Street. Hurwitz said those were out lots and Schnucks would be on the north end of the property. Squires asked if initially Schnucks would only occupy the north section of the property if the trees would stay if the out lots were not purchased. Hurwitz said in order to meet City Code, Planning Commission, drainage, utility requirements, entrances, etc., the entire parcel will be developed fully from day one except for the areas for detention.

Anne Logue stated that she was in attendance at that Park Board meeting and Sgro said they were misrepresented. They are concerned that there is some confusion and some inaccuracies here. She said protecting the green space and ancient trees that add natural beauty and value are important. They provide an excellent storm water management function. Clear cutting of the trees would destroy a natural storm water management function. The area where Griffin Woods is located is surrounded by failed and struggling strip mall businesses. She does not understand why Schnucks wants to put a strip mall in there when area businesses are struggling. Springfield is littered with abandoned mall sites and tearing down ancient forest growth is short sided and environmentally irresponsible. Schnucks has a reputation to do the right thing. She said she is a fan of Schnucks as it is the only union grocery store in town. She said she only shops there. She said Schnucks has supported the reusable bag program when other businesses in town have not. They were the first grocery stores in the area to offer earth friendly products. Several environmental groups are interested in working to restore the woods to its natural beauty. Why not create a park where people can go once they have stopped at the store? A park will benefit more people than another business in the area and local residents will be more inclined to visit the store if this business lived up to the reputation it has sought to preserve. Once the ancient forest growth and trees are gone, they cannot be gotten back. She finds it hard to believe that Schnucks' hands are tied by city ordinances. It is clearly shown that the City Council has been very flexible with Schnucks – too much so.

Factor asked if information regarding the old growth trees on this property was available to the Land Subdivision Committee when the decision was made and if it should be reconsidered on this basis. Sims said the Planning Commission uses and the Committee has available to it the Inventory of Natural Resources which was done by the Friends of Sangamon Valley for that purpose. This inventory identifies natural areas throughout the area including this one and provides a grading system for that. Areas are graded using an A through E scale with D being severely degraded. This area is graded a D. This information was available to the Land Subdivision Committee. This area was classified a 9 which refers to the type of standing trees. It is not rated as an old growth type of forested area. It has a lot of outside growth which has evolved over time. Zeibert said the plan was sent out to various departments for review including the Illinois Department of Natural Resources which uses the EcoCat tool to determine if there are any endangered species there or in their terms classified as natural inventory. Their report came back with no evidence of those things. Factor asked if anyone was aware that there are old growth trees on the property. Sims said Commission staff was aware of what was in the inventory which is used for purposes such as this one. As to if anyone on any staff physically went out and checked trees on the property, the answer is no. Factor said that is not a direct answer, but said she would take it. She said that she has evidence that the old existing oak trees are documented.

Logue said they are aware of the rating of the woods by the Friends of Sangamon Valley and that the county after that rating according to George Rose, who is a board member of the Friends of Sangamon Valley was that those woods would be upgraded should the exotics (garlic, mustard, etc.) be cleared from there so it was never like it could never be upgraded.

She said he was talking about doing the same to those woods as they do in Washington Park. So if the thought was that the woods could never be upgraded, that was incorrect. She said she loves the trees, but does not want to be categorized as someone who hugs the trees. That is not her primary issue. She lives in the neighborhood and looks at how stuff south of Jefferson and Madison continues to encroach upon that area and the deteriorating buildings. She said she was here because there are sound residential neighborhoods there.

Chairman Hansen said there was already a motion to concur with the action of the Land Subdivision to approve the location & sketch map and variances. Kenneth Springs seconded the motion and the roll call vote was unanimous.

Zeibert noted that this body makes a recommendation to the City Council. The plan will now proceed to the City Council for final action. Sims said that would be the perfect time for the legal questions to be asked as the Corporation Counsel will be in attendance at that meeting.

Schnucks East Subdivision

Preliminary Plan

Variance of Sec. 153.157(B)(3) – Street Offsets – to permit driveways that have less than 150' separation from each other

Description: Pt. SW ¼, Section 36, T16N, R5W (Southwest corner of Singer Avenue and Dirksen Parkway)

LSC Action: Recommend approval of the preliminary plan and variance.

Zeibert said the Planning Commission reviewed the location & sketch map a couple of months ago. This development is located off of Dirksen Parkway and Singer Avenue and is part of the J.C. Penney lot. It is 11 acres and is proposed to be split into two lots. An existing access point, Shackleford Drive will be used to serve Lot 2. They are also proposing two more access points for Lot 1. A variance of Sec. 153.157(B)(3) – Street Offsets is being requested to permit driveways that have less than 150' separation from each other.

Kenneth Springs moved to concur with the action of the Land Subdivision Committee to approve the preliminary plan and variance. Tim Moore seconded the motion and the roll call vote was unanimous.

1109 North Koke Mill Road

Variance of Sec. 153.145.1 – Adjacent Substandard Roadway Improvement Agreement

– to allow a tract survey without having to pay the substandard road improvement

Description: Pt. SE ¼, Section 24, T16N, R6W (West side of Koke Mill Road, south of Jefferson Street)

LSC Action: Recommend denial of the variance (6 yes, 5 no).

Zeibert said this is a two acre parcel off of Koke Mill Road, south of Jefferson Street. A variance of Sec. 153.145.1 – Adjacent Substandard Roadway Improvement Agreement – to allow a tract survey without having to pay the substandard road improvement is being requested. The owner would like to divide the two existing residences that have been there for some time. This may proceed using the tract survey process once zoning variances are approved as well as sign-off from the Department of Public Works or City of Springfield for the Substandard Roadway Improvement Agreement.

Whenever a parcel is located along an arterial, it must abide by that agreement and put up a surety to improve that road.

Tim Moore asked what the rationale was for the Land Subdivision Committee denial of the variance. Zeibert said the SSCRPC staff recommended approval of the variance because there are two existing residences there and will still be two residences there if the property were split, thereby no impacts to the road. He said some discussion at the Land Subdivision Committee was that the circumstance was not unique which is a standard for variation and therefore they recommended denial. Sims noted this property is located in unincorporated Sangamon County, but within the 1½ mile jurisdiction of the City of Springfield. He said there have been a few tract surveys brought before the Regional Planning Commission in the past couple of years where property has been divided for re-mortgaging purposes. If that were to happen in the city's jurisdiction along a major/minor arterial, the city requires that a surety or bond be provided to improve the arterial along the frontage of that property simply to refinance a mortgage. This is a similar situation. Zeibert noted that zoning variances will still be needed.

Tim Moore moved to not agree with the Land Subdivision Committee's recommendation to deny the variance thereby approving the variance. Kenneth Springs seconded the motion.

Roger Blickensderfer asked about the variance. Sims said the variance would relieve the property owner of having to pay for road improvements. The cost would be \$125 per linear foot plus 10%. Blickensderfer asked what the cost of the surety would be. Sims said that is determined by the city. Phil Martin said 209' at \$137.50. Chairman Hansen said \$28,737.

Roz Stein said there is a house in the back and a house in the front of the property with separate driveways. The front road is maintained by the county and the driveways maintained by the property owner. Dividing the property would result in no changes to existing driveways/road maintenance. She said paying the surety is costly and she is just trying to leave the neighborhood without a rental property and be able to sell one of the houses. Chairman Hansen asked if it was true that Ms. Stein's father built both houses. Stein said that was correct and that they were built in the 1960s.

Martin said Ms. Stein is not his client, but he would be bringing another variance to the Regional Planning Commission next month. He said requirements are very rigid and there has been no flexibility in these situations. He said the city is trying to cover the cost of road improvements. \$137.50 per lineal foot pays for half of a three lane section. He felt those costs should apply to large developments, not these situations. He said he is chairman of a committee working on the developer's agreement. He said they have not met in a couple of years, but are trying to get things fixed. Moore said he has seen a lot of these situations at the county level. He doesn't feel that property owners in these situations should be saddled with that cost. He said when a large development occurs and when a tar and chip road would go from 8 cars per day to 108 cars per day, that is the problem.

A roll call vote to disagree with the Land Subdivision Committee recommendation to deny the variance thereby approving the variance was unanimous.

**Carpet Weaver's
Site Development Plan**

Description: Pt. NW ¼, Section 19, T15N, R5W (West side of Conestoga Drive, north of Prairie Crossing Drive)

LSC Action: Recommend approval of the site development plan.

Zeibert said this is a 1.82 acre parcel located on Conestoga next to O'Charley's in front of the Myer's development in Prairie Crossing. It requires the site development plan process due to the shared access easement that has been established. Whenever the sole access to a parcel is through a shared access easement, it needs to go through the site development plan process.

Brad Mills moved to concur with the action of the Land Subdivision Committee to approve the site development plan. Kenneth Springs seconded the motion and a roll call vote was unanimous.

**Robert's Automotive
Site Development Plan**

Description: Pt. N ½, Section 14, T15N, R6W (West side of Pleasant Run, south of Wabash Avenue)

LSC Action: Recommend approval of the site development plan.

Zeibert said this is another site development plan of 1.3 acres located off of Wabash Avenue, west of Meadowbrook Road, next to Buffalo Wild Wings and Culver's. It is required to go through the site development plan process due to a shared access easement. He said the Land Subdivision Committee recommended approval of the site development plan subject to some requirements. All requirements have been met, but one – the sidewalk along Wabash Avenue requires an IDOT sign-off or permit which has not been obtained yet.

Sims said his understanding from IDOT is that they are willing to provide the easement, but there is a debate between IDOT and the City of Springfield regarding maintenance of the sidewalk. Sims said his recommendation would be to approve it as it stands since it has to go to the city and it won't be held up. The other option would be to deny and the only advantage to the developer would be that there is an appeals process.

Tim Moore moved to recommend approval of the site development plan subject to an IDOT sign-off/permit for the sidewalk. Kenneth Springs seconded the motion and a voice vote was unanimous.

**McDonald's
Site Development Plan**

Description: Pt. SE ¼, Section 11, T15N, R6W (North side of Wabash Avenue, south of Yucan Drive, adjacent to the Qik-N-EZ gas station)

LSC Action: Recommend approval of the site development plan.

Zeibert said this proposed McDonald's development on 1.4 acres is located across the road from the proposed Robert's Automotive site along Wabash Avenue due east of the Qik-N-EZ. It is being processed through the site development plan process as there are shared access easements. Similar to Robert's Automotive, the IDOT permit for the sidewalk has not yet been obtained.

Tim Moore moved concur with the action of the Land Subdivision Committee to approve the site development plan subject to getting an IDOT sign-off/permit for the sidewalk. Brad Mills seconded the motion and a voice vote was unanimous.

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

There was no unfinished business.

11. NEW BUSINESS.

A. Resolution Pertaining to Record of Decision Regarding Tier II EIS.

Sims summarized a resolution (see attached) that basically supports the determination by the Illinois Department of Transportation that the 3rd Street Rail Corridor be relocated to 10th Street for high speed rail.

Tim Moore moved to approve the resolution. Kenneth Springs seconded the motion and a voice vote was unanimous.

12. ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:28 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mary Jane Niemann".

Mary Jane Niemann
Recording Secretary



**A Resolution by
the Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission
Pertaining to Railroad Consolidation and High Speed Passenger Rail in
Springfield, Illinois**

WHEREAS, the Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission (SSCRPC) was created for the purpose of guiding and accomplishing the coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development of the region so as to best promote the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, efficiency, and economy for the general welfare of the region; and

WHEREAS, the City of Springfield has long suffered due to the number of railway corridors that bisect the city-center from north to south, creating a barrier to coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development; and

WHEREAS, the staff of the SSCRPC has conducted numerous studies and provided valuable analysis pertaining to how the uses of these various corridors might be affected by the proposed St. Louis, MO, to Chicago, IL, high speed passenger rail service and anticipated increases in freight rail traffic through the city-center; and

WHEREAS, the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) has now released a Tier 2 draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that studied and addressed rail improvements in Springfield necessary to best implement the high speed passenger rail service as well as address anticipated rail freight traffic demand; and

WHEREAS, IDOT recommends selection of Alternative 2A, the relocation of the existing Union Pacific Railroad freight and passenger rail corridor (the 3rd Street Rail Corridor) to a new location parallel to the Norfolk Southern Railroad tracks on 10th Street (the 10th Street Corridor).

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission supports and endorses the IDOT recommendation of Alternative 2A, finding that it provides a safer alternative than the others considered, would provide for more effective and efficient vehicle movement in the region than exists currently or under the other options considered, is more sensitive to the community's social, cultural and economic resources, and addresses problems previously identified through the extensive analysis conducted by the SSCRPC's staff.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Executive Director of the SSCRPC provide copies of this resolution to the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Federal Railroad Administration, and any others that he might find relevant to the purpose of alternative selection.

APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION THIS 18th DAY OF July, 2012.

SIGNED: 
Hon. Eric Hansen, Chairman

ATTESTED: 
Mr. E. Norman Sims, Exec. Dir.